DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 065 CE 048 970

AUTHOR	Warren, William H.
TITLE	State Funding of Non-Credit Postsecondary Education and Training for Adults.
INSTITUTION	Commission on Higher Education and the Adult Learner, Columbia, MD.
PUB DATE	Dec 86
NOTE	46p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Council on Education Commission on Higher Education and the Adult Learner, 10840 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 203, Columbia, MD 21044 ($2.50).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education; *Adult Programs; Disabilities; Disadvantaged; Dislocated Workers; Displaced Homemakers; Economic Development; Job Training; *Noncredit Courses; Postsecondary Education; *State Aid; *State Programs

ABSTRACT

Responding to an inquiry from a state that does not fund noncredit instruction but that is under pressure to reconsider its position, the American Council on Education conducted a survey to determine what states fund noncredit postsecondary education for adults and what types of training are funded. In the spring and summer of 1986, two questionnaires were addressed to the states. The first, to the state higher education executive officer, asked about state funding for noncredit courses in the state's colleges and universities. The second questionnaire was sent to the Office of the Governor in each state and sought to broaden the scope of the inquiry by asking if the state provided any funding for the instruction of adults in noncredit courses at the postsecondary level. Forty-one of the 50 states responded to the first questionnaire, and 35 to the second; all but 3 states replied to one or the other. The study found that 29 states (almost 60 percent) fund some kind of noncredit, postsecondary education or training for adults. However, these efforts were scattered and often dependent on federal funds. Programs funded by the states could be grouped in five general areas: general public education, occupational skill improvement, economic development, targeted populations, and comprehensive solutions. Most courses and programs are being delivered by the existing public postsecondary institutions. (This report summarizes state-funded postsecondary educational efforts by the states. Also included is a table that presents an overview of state-funded, noncredit, postsecondary education and training programs for adults.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED288065

STATE FUNDING OF NON-CREDIT POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR ADULTS

William H. Warren

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W Warren

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

American Council on Education
Commission on Higher Education and the Adult Learner
10840 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 203
Columbia, Maryland 21044

CE054897

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATE FUNDING OF NON-CREDIT POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR ADULTS

William H. Warren

December 1986

American Council on Education
Commission on Higher Education and the Adult Learner
10840 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 203
Columbia, Maryland 21044

Copyright 1986 The Commission on Higher Education and
the Adult Learner and the American Council on Education

STATE FUNDING OF NON-CREDIT POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR ADULTS

If, by delegating authority for education to the states, the Founding Fathers intended to ensure educational diversity, they succeeded magnificently and without doubt beyond their wildest imaginings. That is one unequivocal conclusion to be drawn from a recent study of state funding of non-credit, postsecondary instruction for adult learners.

The Commission on Higher Education and the Adult Learner undertook the study after receiving an inquiry from a state that does not fund non-credit instruction but is under pressure to reconsider its position; they sought information about how other states have solved the problems they now face. Based on our returns,[1] close to 60% of the states underwrite part or all of the

---

[1] The findings in this report are based on responses to survey questionnaires and on materials provided by the respondents. It does not purport to be a comprehensive study of all state-funded non-credit postsecondary instruction. Depending on the internal distribution of our requests to the states for information, some relevant programs in some states have probably not been reported to us. We regret any such omissions and readers are invited to write us about them. However, we believe the information that is included to be accurate as of the summer of 1986, when the surveys were returned. All respondents have since had opportunity to review the text and to provide corrections up to November 15, 1986.

cost of at least some kind of non-credit instruction at the postsecondary level. However, the great majority of states either provide funding for very limited programming or provide no state underwriting of non-credit postsecondary instruction. Among those that do fund non-credit instruction, the variety of vehicles through which it is authorized and funded and the ways it is constrained defy simple description or categorization. Nevertheless, we propose to convey something of that variety, to identify patterns where we found them, and to present an array of models that may be examined for possible emulation.[2]

The states are faced with increasing demands on their educational resources to serve the needs of social and economic development. As the workforce ages and the economic base shifts away from production toward service industries and from low technology to high technology, the needs for re-education and retraining are creating growing pressures for better, more comprehensive, more accessible education and training resources. The pressures are compounded by social concerns for the economically and educationally disadvantaged including unemployed youth, welfare recipients, displaced homemakers, and the underemployed. Most of the need will continue to be met outside of the degree programs of the states' colleges and universities, in settings that award neither academic credit nor degrees, often under an employer's auspices. But the states have been taking an

---

[2] Some states fund courses and programs for academic credit that are similar to those described in this report; because they are not non-credit programs, however, they are not addressed in this report.

increasingly active role and most of the extant programs have been launched within the past decade.

To learn what kinds of non-credit activities the states are funding, in the spring and summer of 1986 the Commission addressed two questionnaires to the states. The first, to the state higher education executive officer (SHEEO), asked "Does your state support fully or partially with public funds any non-credit courses and/or programs in the state's tax-supported or independent colleges and universities?" If the answer was affirmative, respondents were asked to reply to additional questions concerning policy and practice.

The second questionnaire was sent to the Office of the Governor and sought to broaden the scope of the inquiry by asking, "Does your state provide any funding for the instruction of adults in non-credit courses or programs at the postsecondary level?" Again, respondents were asked to elaborate on affirmative replies. This report summarizes and examines responses to both questionnaires, in some cases augmented from Commission files on state policy and programs for adult learners.

Forty-one of the 50 states responded to the SHEEO's questionnaire (82%) and 35 (70%) replied to the Governor's; all but three states replied to one or the other and 30 (60%) responded to both inquiries. Although more than half of the states -- 29 by our count -- are funding some kind of non-credit postsecondary education, the patterns for doing so are very different from state to state.

In posing our questions and in analyzing the responses, we have adopted several definitions and

conventions. "Non-credit instruction" included in our data refers to courses and programs that neither provide academic credit nor lead to an academic degree; however, Continuing Education Units (CEU's), certificates, or other forms of recognition of completion may be awarded. "Postsecondary" refers to education or training that presumes the possession by the student or trainee of a high school diploma or a GED equivalency certificate. This precludes courses and programs that are clearly elementary- or secondary-level education, such as Adult Basic Education, high school completion programs for adults, preparation for the GED exam, etc. But we have included programs for which the level is unclear or not exclusively postsecondary, that might serve non-graduates from high school (e.g., programs prescribed by the state for persons "age 16 or over not in school"), that are vocational but include adults.

Further, we have tried to focus on state initiatives. Federal funds that are channeled through the states are not considered for our purposes to be "state funds," even when some state match is required. JTPA and Vocational Education programs and others that are 100% federally funded, or nearly so, are therefore excluded from our report to the extent that we can identify them. We have also excluded the Cooperative Extension Service, although it is only 32% federally funded (47% by the state, 18% by the county, 3% private sector), because in most states it has been historically and fundamentally a federal initiative. At the same time, we have included programs that we believe receive some federal aid provided the bulk of the funding appears to be from within the state. It is not always easy to distinguish clearly on these dimensions, and we know that we have some gray areas. We have also excluded, on the premise that they are not funded programs, the numerous state provisions

waiving tuition for senior citizens who enroll on a space-available basis.

Finally, we have adopted a fairly strict interpretation of "instruction" by excluding from our data those situations in which the state permits public funds to be used to underwrite administrative or other indirect costs of non-credit programs but requires the programs to be otherwise self-supporting, necessitating the charging of full tuition to cover direct costs.

Adopting this set of definitions and conventions narrows our emphasis to encompass primarily state initiatives that address the educational and training needs of adult learners at the postsecondary level. We believe that this is consistent with our objective of providing information that may be of assistance to states that wish now, in the late 1980's, to review current policies and practices and reconsider their commitments to the education of adults.

In looking at the data, one sees patterns of response to social and economic challenges that have gained primacy in the current decade: dislocated workers, displaced homemakers, new technologies, dying industries, unemployment, new occupations, declining exports, unfilled jobs, increasing numbers on welfare, emergence of a "permanent underclass," unutilized capabilities among the underemployed, etc. In many states, education and training are being used, once again, as a major instrument of attack on these problems, many of them hardy perennials.

Without ascribing motives to the proponents, however, it is apparent that in seeking solutions some states have emphasized economic development while others have focused on social welfare. Nowhere do we

find a designed, comprehensive approach to the range of problems. But in a very few states the accumulation of programs, apparently adopted piecemeal, does broadly address an educational solution to the problems identified.

When designing programs, the states tend to specify, in addition to the funding source, three key parameters: the program objectives and strategies which, in turn, constrain the content; the authorized providers; and the clientele to be served. The community colleges, along with their two-year vocational counterparts variously called area vocational schools or centers and technical schools or institutes, are by far the providers of choice. A few extend programs to the state colleges and universities and still fewer fund programs established through RFP's and contracts with non-public institutions and organizations. Several states share costs with employers who are directly benefitting from the education and training provided, but where economic development is aggressively executed the state tends to underwrite the full cost.

The clientele to be served are described in terms that are usually tied to program objectives and strategies, for example, employers, categories of population such as "unemployed", or the general public. The strategies that are paired with program objectives often mirror a particular perspective on the problem being addressed. For example, seeing lack of occupational skills as an economic development problem may lead to training programs that are accessible only as service to specific employers while viewing occupational skills development as a social responsibility tends toward creation of broadly accessible programs.

Both program objectives with their associated strategies and the clientele being served are evident in each of five "threads" that are woven into the fabric of state-funded non-credit education and training. We describe these threads as:

General Public Education
Occupational Skill Improvement
Focus: Economic Development
Targetted Populations
Comprehensive Solutions

These threads, for which we will provide detail and examples, are neither separate "tracks" nor totally discrete. Rather, as a group they tend to address an interrelated set of problems from different perspectives. The threads differ because each state seems to see its problems in its own terms, in one case as an economic problem, in another as a social problem, and in still another as an educational problem. The threads perhaps also reflect political power in the state, sometimes held by the economic developers, other times, by the social welfare advocates.

Because they are addressing the same set of problems, the threads are interconnected and overlapping, irrespective of who chooses the language used to describe them. (Because of this, the projection of a dichotomy between economic development and social welfare may be too facile, but there do appear to be at least two distinct perspectives from which problems are addressed and solutions generated. And each approach has a positive impact on solving the problems even as they are perceived from the other perspective.)

GENERAL PUBLIC EDUCATION

This is the historic function of non-credit "continuing education," best illustrated by the community service role of the community colleges and, in a few states, by the state colleges and universities. It antedates the other threads by two or three decades and, where available, serves the general public with an array of courses and programs, for which one may register with minimum barriers. Criteria for admission, if they exist at all, concern residency and ability to benefit; e.g., preparing to enter an occupation or having already entered an occupation and wishing to upgrade or update skills or learn new ones -- hardly exclusive. The providers, in all cases, are part of the state-funded postsecondary education system, most often the two-year colleges.

Based on our returns, nine states -- Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah, and Wisconsin -- provide funding for non-credit offerings[3] with relatively few restrictions on the subject matter. The kind and degree of restriction, expressed either inclusively or exclusively, is the major distinction among the states that fund general public non-credit education. Six of these nine explicitly preclude avocational, recreational, leisure, and hobby courses from funded programs (Florida-except for the aging, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina-

---

[3] As already noted, some states permit their tax-supported institutions to cover costs of administering non-credit instruction and certain related indirect expenses from public funds, but instruction must be self-supporting. Those states are not included in our data on funded non-credit instruction.

partially, Oregon.) The other three (Illinois, Utah, Wisconsin) utilize alternative means of controlling the scope of their programs. We will look at all of them:

Illinois Non-credit courses and programs are funded in the community colleges and state universities without state-level restrictions on topics or clientele. Appropriated funds are provided to the university system which allocates funds to the campuses, so decisions on funding non-credit offerings are made primarily at the campus level, with minor modifications from the system and coordinating board levels.

Iowa Through its "area schools," i.e., the two-year community colleges and vocational schools, Iowa funds three distinct postsecondary programs: two involve entry level and supplementary career courses, discussed below, and the third includes Continuing and General Education Courses, subject matter considered appropriate to contribute to the overall quality of life. All are eligible for state general aid, although the formula is not currently fully funded. Subject matter is limited to seven classifications that include community resource development, state mandated or approved courses (e.g., vehicle operation, relicensure, etc.), legal and consumer rights, programs for individuals with restricted incomes, environmental education, health, and employment and business. There are no restrictions on clientele served although some categories have obvious target enrollment groups.

Maryland Exclusively through its community colleges, Maryland funds one of the broadest of the general public education programs. The State Board for Community Colleges adopted a definition of state-supported continuing education as non-credit courses that "satisfy the vocational development, professional

development, and self-development needs of part-time and returning adult students." Recreational and avocational courses are specifically excluded; proposed courses are submitted to the state Director of Continuing Education, who determines eligibility for state funding. An approved course is eligible for funding for up to two fiscal years. Provision is made for regular reporting and evaluation. A Continuing Education Manual, published by the State Board for Community Colleges, contains all the necessary information and sample forms. In very recent years, the Community College System has launched a special effort to serve new and expanding industries and targetted populations with existing or customized courses, discussed later in this report.

Michigan In addition to an array of targetted programs, described later, Michigan funds exclusively through its community colleges six categories of non-credit instruction for the general public: general [academic]; business and public service; trades, industrial and technical; health occupations; developmental and preparatory; and human development. Personal interest courses including avocational and leisure courses are not funded. Since fiscal 1985, funding for both credit and non-credit courses has been based on contact hours, thereby facilitating the funding of non-credit education and training that the legislature wished to underwrite.

North Carolina In addition to a set of categorically funded programs discussed later, North Carolina funds four classifications of postsecondary "extension courses:" Occupational, Academic, Practical Skills, and Avocational. The last category focuses on personal or leisure needs (e.g., pre-retirement courses) but excludes athletic, game and hobby courses, which must be fully self-supporting. The 58 community

colleges and technical institutes are funded to deliver a broad list of state-approved course titles; participants must be high school graduates or eighteen years of age. The four-year institutions of the state university system receive no funding for direct costs of non-credit instruction, except for continuing education for health professionals.

Oregon Funding is provided for general self-improvement and remediation courses, but not hobby and recreation courses. Each local community college, within a total appropriation for all programs, decides on the extent of its non-credit programming and the non-credit courses to be offered.

Utah Utah funds non-credit instruction in community colleges (partially), area vocational centers (fully), and state colleges and universities (partially), in addition to two targetted programs, discussed later. Institutions have discretion in setting tuition charges to supplement state funding. Consideration is being given to requiring charges for full direct costs of non-credit courses other than vocational-technical courses.

Wisconsin The University of Wisconsin-Extension, with a teaching and coordination mission, provides programs and courses through the state university campuses and two-year undergraduate centers (26 units), and the 72 county extension offices. It operates with a unique mix of state funding with federal funding from the Cooperative Extension Service. Its General Extension activities, as distinct from Cooperative Extension Services, receive state funds to partially underwrite non-credit instruction that is open to all citizens and nearly unrestricted as to content. The fees charged for courses vary depending on the subject matter, liberal studies being more heavily

supported than engineering and management courses. The University Extension also conducts customized programs, for which most of the cost is not state-funded, and targetted programs to meet identified needs. They also operate statewide public educational radio and television.

The ninth state, Florida, has an apparently unique model for offering general education that fits none of our categories very neatly. Community Instructional Services are offered through the community colleges and school districts under the aegis of 28 regional coordinating councils for vocational education, adult general education and community instructional services. A planned activity, course, or program must address a "significant community problem" relating to the environment, health, safety, human relations, government, child rearing, or consumer economics and homemaking. Development of recreational or leisure time skills is excluded except for the aging. Participants are to acquire increased understanding of and alternative solutions to the problem being addressed or knowledge and skills needed to cope with and help solve the problem. Courses must be approved in advance by the regional council but have included, within these authorized outcomes, programs for targetted populations such as displaced homemakers, unemployed workers, and the handicapped and for other special purposes based on locally defined needs.

As can be seen, there is considerable variety among these nine states that underwrite general public education, including the extent to which they provide funding. Most state funding is less than 100% of the cost and the balance comes from the respective local jurisdictions and the students, through fees. But these programs appear to be generally accessible, if one can

get to the class site and meet any fees involved, without other selection criteria, such as membership in a special population, being applied.

OCCUPATIONAL SKILL IMPROVEMENT

Concerned about the general level of occupational skill in the labor force in relation to employment needs and opportunities, a number of states have undertaken to fund both entry level occupational education and training and the upgrading and updating of skills in the existing workforce. Originating in concerns about employment security and economic stability, these programs tend to address the needs of existing industry with entry level and advanced education and training, often favoring those already employed. Our returns indicate that over a dozen states now have such programs. Although these programs are designed and managed in a variety of ways, they are characterized by low fees; utilization of existing courses, i.e., not customized; and absence of barriers to admission except for relevant present skills or prior experience; and by being essentially open to the public who need them. We have grouped them in order of increasing focus or specificity of objectives.

The first group could be the nine states discussed in the preceding section on General Public Education. All of them offer occupational courses, entry level and advanced, but differ from the states in this category by funding, in addition, non-occupational courses and programs.

A second group of eight states -- Alaska, California, Georgia, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Texas, Vermont, and Wyoming --meets the same general criteria

as the General Public Education states (administered through the state postsecondary education system, existing courses, minimal admission barriers) except that they limit the content of funded courses and programs to essentially job-related subject matter. Since the descriptive terminology varies among the states, the respondents' language is used to describe these activities:

Alaska - Occupational and some remedial courses in the community colleges, technical schools, and state universities.

California - Occupational courses in the community colleges and regional occupational centers.

Georgia - One- to two-year full-time vocational programs in Postsecondary Area Vocational Schools and public Junior Colleges for adults desiring initial job preparation skills in over 70 occupational categories.[4]

New Jersey - Courses designed to develop or upgrade occupational skills in the "county [community] colleges."

Pennsylvania - Technical or vocational programs authorized by the State Department of Education in the community colleges.

---

[4] In 1985, Georgia transferred postsecondary vocational education from the State Board of Education to a new State Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education.

Texas - Entry level technical-vocational programs approved by the State Coordinating Board to serve legislative intent and community labor market needs, based on assessment. Provided through community and junior colleges, the state technical institute, and the two-year technical arts component in one state university.

Vermont - Vocational-technical courses and programs funded by the State Department of Education on the basis of proposals from the state community college, state colleges, and area vocational schools (which also serve adults).

Wyoming - Programs, class activities and services in the commununity colleges that provide job skills necessary to remain in or advance as a member of the work force.

To summarize, occupational courses and programs from the existing curriculum are being delivered by the established public postsecondary education system for a largely unrestricted clientele, provided they have the skill-level which the course presumes.

A third group of thirteen states seems to have similar objectives for improving occupational skill levels; it includes some of the foregoing states that have developed special occupational programs to enhance the more general programs already described. But the range of providers is broader, as is the locus of administrative authority within the state bureaucracy. And these programs are more directed, often targetted to specific occupational classifications, although the clientele is not usually restricted. There is less reliance on meeting the

need with existing curricula and readiness to design special courses or programs. In this group are Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington and West Virginia.

Florida offers job preparatory instruction providing entry level skill-specific training through community colleges and voc-tech centers plus supplemental vocational education programs to enable persons who are or have been employed to reenter, maintain stability, or advance within their occupations through courses available in the community colleges.

Georgia, in its Vocational Short-Term Programs offered through the Postsecondary Area Vocational-Technical Schools, serves adults who desire updating or upgrading skills in current employment or retraining for a different occupation due to technological displacement; some programs may be customized. Also, through its state-funded Marine Extension Service, Georgia offers courses in navigational skills, marketing and management to the shellfish industry.

Hawaii, through its community colleges, funds upgrading or retraining programs for workers in construction, governmental service,and hotel maintenance, as well as power machine operators for the garment industry, meat cutters and cooks.

Iowa funds, in addition to its continuing and general education courses, preparatory career courses for those seeking entry level employment and supplementary career courses for currently employed workers, using its "public area schools" (community colleges) as sites.

Michigan augments the program already discussed with a series of directed programs[5], one of which (Michigan Job Opportunity Bank) funds assessment and training for upgrading employees of firms with fewer than 500 employees.

Missouri has a state-funded "Industry Training Program," administered through the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and conducted by area vocational schools and community colleges in conjunction with employers, for workers in need of training, retraining, or upgrading of skills.

New Jersey not only provides occupational training toward securing initial employment or upgrading skills through the county (community) colleges, as already noted, but also funds non-credit courses and programs through the Departments of Labor, Treasury and Transportation.

North Carolina's Cooperative Skills Training Program is categorically funded through the community college system to respond to training needs of employers and employees in existing industries by offering programs in new technologies and other new demands in the workplace.

Ohio has established an Advanced Technology Center at one of its community colleges where CAD/CAM training is offered; a second Center nears completion; both combine private and state funding.

---

[5] See "Investing in People: A Directory of Michigan's Job Training and Related Services," Governor's Office for Job Training, P.O. Box 30039, Lansing, MI 48909, 1986.

Oklahoma, through area voc-tech schools, provides for adults 16 years of age and older part-time or full-time programs of job-related instruction for entry level positions or upgrading; a third program is designed to meet training needs of existing industries generated by new technologies or processes.

Utah's Office of Vocational Education, through the Area Vocational Centers, offers job-specific training to adults as well as high school students; its pilot Principles of Technology Program, available also through higher education institutions, introduces technical topics to the same two groups.

Washington state's Commission for Vocational Education oversees a fully state-funded Job Skills Program in technical and vocational training for entry level positions and upgrading, usually tied to specific jobs and employers; providers may be public or private institutions or business and industry.

The West Virginia Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, offers through the county boards of education "occupationally-specific" programs in about 40 occupations to persons over 16 years of age.

Note the greater diversity represented in this last group: diversity of oversight responsibility, of providers, and of scope of programs. Note also the greater involvement of employers and the narrow focus of some programs, seemingly in response to local economic and political pressures. The variety represented in this group of states almost obscures the connecting theme among these state programs: they all address in a fairly straightforward fashion the improvement of occupational skills, among those already employed and those seeking

employment, apparently as a means of improving employment security and economic stability.

Before we shift to another perspective on provision of education and training, attention is due a related activity that serves both occupational skills improvement and economic development: educational brokering. Although educational brokering is often privately sponsored and user-funded, it is sometimes a state-sponsored and state-funded service. A prime example is the Educational Brokering Service operated by the Vermont State Colleges, to which employers who have education and training needs can turn to locate providers for the kind of program they require. A brokering service representative works with the employer to develop training specifications for an RFP to be sent to a variety of potential providers who have pertinent resources. The service solicits, receives and delivers the proposals to the employer who selects the provider(s); the employer may also use the brokering service to help choose a provider. Although the service is publicly funded, all training costs are borne by the employer. Ohio offers a similar service through its Ohio Technology Transfer Organization (OTTO) which has agents located at the two-year college campuses.

FOCUS: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

In recent years, a number of states have undertaken a policy of aggressive economic development, in competition with neighboring states and the international business and industrial community. Education and training have often been the cornerstone of that policy; for some states, educational resources constitute a major inducement to industry seeking relocation. So it is not surprising to find special state-

funded education and training programs, initiated in the last half-decade, that are oriented toward new and expanding industries in an effort to lure or retain employers. They are variously called "customized" or "high impact" training or programs for "new and expanding industries," "diversification", or for existing businesses. Sometimes they come with related services such as recruitment and placement. Most of these programs are the result of special legislation or earmarking of funds but in at least two states, Maryland and Wisconsin, the provision of new services has occurred using the resources of an existing system.

Eighteen states, based on our returns, have taken such initiatives. There is much more homogeneity among them than in the programs examined thus far. We will explore their common characteristics, see which states offer them, and examine more closely a few prime examples.

Without exception, these special programs and courses offer some degree of customization of the education or training program, but draw from existing curricula when they are relevant to the need. Some rely on assessing the needs of the local labor market in defining programs; others work in conjunction with present or potential local employers to design employer-specific programs. So the clientele is usually restricted to persons who are employed, have a guarantee of employment, or can readily be employed because of rising local demand for the skills they are acquiring. In most cases funding is made available for a specifically identified need through a grant or agreement for a finite period. The publicly funded institutions are typically the authorized providers, although there are exceptions. The administering department is usually

education-related, but in four states the economic development agency oversees the programs.

Of the eighteen different states that offer customized programs (or courses), thirteen direct funding to education and training for "new and expanding industries" or "...businesses," but some include all those who "create new jobs." Ten states offer customized training without restricting the targets. (Five provide earmarked funding in both categories.) Table I summarizes information on the customized programs in these eighteen states.

Several of these programs bear further examination as illustrative models for possible emulation: Pennsylvania, Illinois, Iowa, and Massachusetts and Kentucky.

In 1982, Pennsylvania established a statewide "Customized Job Training Program" (CJT) that was, according to the announcement, "a new job training program designed to meet the specific needs of companies that create new jobs...." It supports short-term vocational employment training designed to prepare persons for new, employer-committed jobs that arise from decisions to locate or expand in the state. The education or training is designed in cooperation with a particular employer and provided by a public institution: high school, community college, area vocational-technical school, state college or university or a university campus center -- nearly 800 potential providers, 150 of them postsecondary. The state provides or funds classrooms, equipment, materials, and instructors (including employees of the company being served to teach highly specialized skills). The program is coordinated by the Governor's Economic Development Committee with the Departments of Education,

TABLE I

CUSTOMIZED EDUCATION & TRAINING PROGRAMS

State/Title	Providers	Admnstn
NEW & EXPANDING INDUSTRIES		
Alabama		
Training for Industry	CC,Tech	DoPSE
Florida		
Sunshine State Skills Prog	CC	SBCC
Industry Services Trng Prog	CC,SchBds, then any agency or publ instn	DoEd
Georgia		
Quick Start	AVocTch& state-run JrColl	StBdof PstSec VocEd
Vocational Short-term Prog[6]	AVoTchSch	do.
Iowa		
Industrial New Jobs Trng Prog	CC&ArVoS	DEcDev
Small Bus New Jobs Trng. Prog	do.	do.

- continued next page -

[6] Training within the Vocational Short-term Programs may be customized for particular employers although most of the programs are not customized and have open admission.

TABLE I -- NEW & EXPANDING INDUSTRIES (Cont'd)

Maryland[7]		
Economic Development Initiative	CC	StBdCC
Michigan		
Business & Industrial Trng Prog (incl retraining services)	DofLabor	DoLab
Missouri		
Job Development Fund	AVoSch,CC, PubColl w/ employers	DEcDev
North Carolina		
New & Expanding Industries Prog	CCw/emplr	DoCC
Small Business Centers	CC&others	DoCC
Ohio		
Ohio Industrial Training Prog	Propriet'y Voc'l, CC	DoDev
Oklahoma		
Training for Industry Program	AVoTchSch	DVoTEd

- continued next page -

[7] Unlike the others in this set, Maryland and Wisconsin have created customized programs and courses within existing program structures, the community colleges in Maryland under the State (coordinating) Board and the University of Wisconsin-Extension, rather than through legislation and earmarked funds.

TABLE I -- NEW & EXPANDING INDUSTRIES (Cont'd)

Pennsylvania		
Customized Job Training Program	CC,AVoTS, SC&U,HS, UnivCtrs	EcDvCo
Utah		
Critical Industries or Custom FIT Training	AVocCtrs, HiEdInst, PubSchls	OfVoEd
Wisconsin[7]		
General Extension	StUn& UGCtr	UWiExt
UNRESTRICTED		
Arkansas		
Educational Development Fund[8]	PubC&U	DoHiEd
Illinois		
High Impact Training Services	CC	StBdEd
Iowa		
Short Term Preparatory Course	AreaSc(CC)	DoEd

- continued next page -

[8] The Fund supports "...projects dealing with furthering the economic development of the state." Only a limited portion of the funds go for education and training, through grants to selected public colleges and universities.

TABLE I -- UNRESTRICTED (Continued)

Kentucky		
Bluegrass State Skills Corp.	Public, Non-pub, Indepndnt	DoEd
Maryland		
Economic Developmt Initiative	CC	SBCC
Massachusetts		
Bay State Skills Corp.	CC,Tech, StC&U,HS, VocEd, Indepndnt	NPCorp
Michigan		
Com'ty Coll Investment Prog	CC	DoEd
North Carolina		
Cooperative Skills Program	CC	DoCC
Texas		
Adult Voc'l Educ'n & Trng	CC,TechIn, TechArts	StCooB
Wisconsin		
General Extension	StUn& UGCtr	UWiExt

Commerce, and Labor and Industry. In the first 18 months of the program, $4.5 million dollars were directed to the program; 3,000 workers completed training and were placed or upgraded; 500 were in training; 850 were awaiting training.

The "High Impact Training Services" in Illinois, administered by the State Board of Education, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, the Chamber of Commerce, the Board of Higher Education, and the Illinois Community College Board, funds employer-specific education and training programs through the community colleges. In fiscal 1985, $1.6 million was allocated to 110 programs engaging over 2500 employees and trainees in entry level, retraining and upgrading courses.

The two Iowa "new jobs training" programs were established about 1983 under the Department of Economic Development for delivery through 15 "area colleges" (13 community colleges and two postsecondary vocational schools.) When the training needs have been established with the employer and priced, if the size of the contract warrants it (the "Industrial" program) the state sells certificates, on which the principal and interest are guaranteed, to cover training costs. The certificates are paid off over ten years from two revenue sources: the increase in property taxes derived from the industrial growth and 1 1/2% of the state income tax withheld on wages of the new employees. For small training needs when issuance of certificates is not justified (the "Small Business" program), funds are borrowed from the state and repaid from the same revenue sources as the certificates. This appears to be a unique way of funding training for new jobs.

First Massachusetts and later Kentucky established quasi-public corporations, the Bay State Skills Corporation (1982) and the Bluegrass State Skills Corporation (1984), respectively, to improve employment opportunities through expansion of skills training and education. In Massachusetts, the corporation, currently funded by the state at $4 million annually, operates a 50-50 grant program (state funds must be matched dollar for dollar in cash or kind by the private sector) to any secondary or postsecondary, profit or non-profit institution for education and training in collaboration with business and industry. Its objectives are 1) to provide entry level job training to the employed or unemployed with a minimum placement rate of 70%; 2) to provide retraining or upgrading in the private sector resulting in a wage increase and retention of the job; 3) to provide for the creation and retention in the curriculum of new advanced courses to meet industrial needs. Private sector partners are directly involved with the educational institution in course and program design and delivery, trainee recruitment and selection, course instruction, and placement. Most of the providers are postsecondary institutions with heavy involvement of the community colleges, but the courses developed range from entry level through graduate and professional school offerings.

In Kentucky, the corporation, as part of its function, collects and disseminates information on present and projected employment need and provides grants-in-aid of up to $200,000 to educational institutions (public or non-public secondary or postsecondary or independent postsecondary). The grants are to "facilitate the formation of comprehensive relationships with business and industry which secure for such [educational] institutions the information, technical assistance, and financial support necessary for

the development and significant expansion of programs of skills training and education consistent with employment need" in the state. The commitment of financial support from business and industry for any program must be at least equal to the grant-in-aid so the state funds no more than half of the cost of skills training and education. The corporation was launched with funding for fiscal 1985 at $438,000.

Of these five state programs, the ones in Illinois and Pennsylvania are most characteristic of the set, the Iowa programs are uniquely funded, while the quasi-public corporations are organizational exceptions, although their objectives are similar. Variations within this set occur in the degree of private sector involvement, the ratio of state funding to private sector or tuition fee match, how the clientele is defined, and the range of authorized providers.

TARGETTED POPULATIONS

While the targetting of populations for special attention is hardly a new political phenomenon, most of the programs in the fifteen states that focus occupational education and training programs on strictly defined groups of adults have been established within the past decade. (Educational programs for prison inmates are a significant exception; they are not addressed in this report.) As observed earlier, there is a clear distinction between states apparently emphasizing economic development and those seeming to press for social welfare. Of the 24 different states that have at least one program that places them in either the Focus: Economic Development set or the Targetted Populations set, ten -- Alabama, Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, North Carolina, Oklahoma,

Texas, Utah, and Wisconsin -- appear in both sets. The other six "social welfare" states apparently have no state-funded education and training programs tied directly to economic development.

Among the sixteen states that target populations, we again find a variety of programs, ways of administering them, and definitions of the providers but a fairly consistent description of authorized course or program content: job related, leading to employment. As with their economic development efforts, Maryland and Wisconsin utilize existing resources in the community colleges and University Extension, respectively, not specifically legislated programs. There are 33 identifiable programs (including the Maryland and Wisconsin efforts) serving five distinct populations:

1) Displaced homemakers (sometimes including single parents and/or persons seeking non-traditional careers), usually defined as persons forced to enter or re-enter the workforce because of separation, divorce, death, or disability of the spouse. [Code DH, 10 programs]

2) The unemployed and those facing layoffs (sometimes specifically including displaced workers and those whose unemployment compensation has been exhausted.) [Code UFL, 12 programs]

3) Welfare and Public Assistance recipients. [Code WR, 3 programs]

4) Women. [Code WO, 2 programs]

5) The educationally or economically disadvantaged. [Code EED, 4 programs]

A sixth program target that we have called "Special Programs" [Code Spec] includes Disadvantaged, Minority and Women's Business Enterprises in Michigan and handicapped adults in Florida. Table II summarizes these 33 programs.

Several of the states have taken distinctive approaches in dealing with these targetted populations. As noted, California (1982) has dedicated 1% of the employer contributions to the state unemployment compensation fund to retraining skilled workers whose jobs have become obsolete. The Maine Department of Educational and Cultural Services, Bureau of Adult and Secondary Vocational Education makes grants to public educational institutions and community agencies for training programs that are targetted to a local population with need, e.g., single parents and homemakers, women, women seeking careers in the construction trades, etc.

One of the more successful attacks on reducing welfare costs is the Massachusetts "ET CHOICES" program that offers training to recipients of public assistance. By July 1985, nearly 17,000 recipients had completed the program and gone on to full- or part-time unsubsidized employment with a retention rate after 30 days of 85%; those on full-time jobs, on average, were earning double what they were receiving on public assistance and 70% had employer-provided health care coverage. The savings in welfare benefits were $50 million in less than two years.

Michigan has a broad array of targetted programs, to be discussed further in the next section. New York has two singular programs: the Occupational Retraining and Reemployment Act (ORRA) and the Educational Opportunity Centers (EOC). ORRA (1984) provides

TABLE II
EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR TARGETTED POPULATIONS

State/Program Title	Clntle	Providers	Admstn
Alabama			
Displaced Homemakers Prog	DH	Jr&CC, TechSch	DoPSE
California			
Employment Trng Panel[9]	UFL	Sec,PoSec, Prof,Non-Profit, Emplyrs	--
Worksite Educn & Trng Act	UFL	Emplyrs	--
Florida			
Community Instruct'l Serv (locally targetted - see text)	DH, UFL, SPEC	CC,VoTch	RegBds
Hawaii			
Skill Prog-Selected Occup.	UFL	CC	CC
Employment Prep. & Trng.	EED	CC	CC
Maine			
Vocational Educ Act Grants	DH, WO	VoTechI, AdEdCtrs	DoEd& CulSv

- continued next page -

[9] Funded by 1% of the state Unemployment Compensation paid by employers.

TABLE II -- TARGETTED POPULATIONS (Continued)

Maryland			
Vocatnl-Technical Trng Cs	DH, UFL, EED	CC	StBdCC
Massachusetts			
Emplymt & Trng Choices Pr. (ET CHOICES)	WR	CC, Direct SkillsTrg	DPbWel
Career Educ Incentive Grts	WR	CC	DPbWel
Bay State Centers for Dis-Placed Homemakers	DH	CC,Comty-basedOrg	BSSC
Michigan			
Displaced Homemaker Prog	DH	NewCtrs byRFP	DoLabr
Michigan Job Oppty Bank (MJOB)	UFL	CC	GovOfc forJob Trng
Mich Oppty & Skills Trg (MOST)	WR	Unrestr-byRFP	DoSoSv
DBE/MBE/WBE Suptng Serv	Spec[10]	Cnsltnts	DoTran

- continued next page -

[10] This is a unique program that targets Disadvantaged, Minority, and Women's Business Enterprises for training and technical assistance.

TABLE II -- TARGETTED PROGRAMS (Continued)

New York			
Occupational Retrng & Re-employment Act(ORRA)	UFL	Unrestr	NYSEdD
Educatl Opportunity Ctrs	EED	EOC	SUNY-SpProg
North Carolina			
Human Resrcs Dvlpmt Prog	UFL	CC	DoCC
Oklahoma			
Special Adult Trng Prog[11]	DH, UFL	ArVoTch	DVoTEd
Texas			
Adult Vocatl Educn & Trg	UFL	PubC&JC, TechInst	CordBd
Utah			
Short-term Intensive Trng Program (STIT)	DH, UFL	ArVoCtr, Colleges	OfVoEd Regnts
Vermont			
Educl Grants for Unemplyd Vermonters Program	UFL	AVoTCtr, CC,SC&U, TechSch	VStAst Corp

- Continued next page -

[11] Guidance and counseling programs for targetted clienteles, who will use existing full-time and part-time adult training programs that are not targetted.

TABLE II -- TARGETTED POPULATIONS (Continued)

Washington			
Displaced Homemaker Prog	DH	Pub&Priv Non-Prof Orgztns	HEdCo-ordBd
Wisconsin			
General Extension	DH, EED, WO	StUn,2yr UGCtrs	UWiExt

workers on unemployment compensation or whose compensation has been exhausted with approved non-degree technical or vocational programs leading to employment; providers include public postsecondary institutions, employers, unions, and private schools. EOC (1966), directed through selected campuses of the State University of New York, serve educationally and economically disadvantaged adults with tuition-free academic and vocational programs that lead to employment readiness or upgrading.

Finally, Vermont (1984) has addressed assistance to the unemployed with financial need through Educational Grants for Unemployed Vermonters that provide "grants to cover training in non-degree programs leading to improved employability." The awards pay full tuition up to $125 per semester in eligible institutions, but may be coupled with other financial aid.

The programs described in these five states are, to our knowledge, unique or have distinctive aspects that set them apart as possible models.

COMPREHENSIVE SOLUTIONS

Among the respondents to our inquiries, we have found no state that set out to design a comprehensive approach to the broad range of social and economic problems addressed through the variety of programs described in this paper. However, three states, Florida, Michigan, and North Carolina, have built through accrual rather than design a set of programs that are responsive to many, but not all, of the problems cited among the respondents. Two other states, Maryland and Wisconsin, have focussed efforts within existing programs to meet the new needs.

Michigan underwrites programs in nine of the ten categories used in our analysis (see Table III). They fund six types of non-credit instruction within the community colleges for the general public, including entry level and advanced occupational courses. They also sponsor occupational improvement programs, customized education and training tied to economic development, and targetted programs for three populations: displaced homemakers, the unemployed, and welfare recipients. Michigan has recently published an excellent directory of job training and related services, described in an earlier footnote.

Florida mounts programs in seven of our categories, including general publc education through its unique Community Instructional Services (in the community colleges and school disricts); job preparatory and supplemental occupational education and training in the community colleges and vo-tech centers; customized courses and programs; and programs for displaced homemakers, unemployed workers and handicapped adults.

North Carolina funds programs in six of our ten categories. It offers four classifications of "extension courses," among them occupational and practical skills, through its community colleges and technical institutes. It also provides occupational skills improvement through a Cooperative Skills Training Program, customized education and training for new and expanding industries, and a targetted program for the unemployed.

In Maryland and Wisconsin there does not appear to have been any separate legislative action, as occurred in the other states, to earmark funding to increase the state's responsiveness to the new set of problems. Rather, the existing providers simply identified a broader range of needs to be met with the resources at hand and directed their outreach to the clienteles involved. Wisconsin, through the General Extension Program of the University of Wisconsin-Extension, funds education and training in seven of the ten categories in our analysis. Similarly, in Maryland the State Board for Community Colleges has promoted its courses and services to be responsive to new needs and special populations; these efforts occur in eight of the ten categories analyzed.

All the other states that responded are represented in only half or fewer of the ten categories of programs in Table III.

SUMMARY

In analysing the data provided by the 47 states that responded to at least one of our two questionnaires, augmented by information from our files on state policy, we identified ten types of non-credit

postsecondary instruction being supported with state funds:

General public education - GPE (code for Table III)

General entry level skills training - ELS

Training to update and upgrade skills - UUS

Customized education and training - new and expanding industries - CNX

Customized education and training -unrestricted- CUR

Displaced homemakers programs (including single parents, women, and non-traditional occupations) - DHP

Unemployed workers programs (including displaced workers, those facing layoffs) - UNW

Public assistance recipients programs - PAR

Programs for the educationally and economically disadvantaged - EED

Special programs - SPC

Table III presents an overview of state-funded, non-credit, postsecondary education and training programs for adults, within these ten categories. It indicates only the presence of a program that fits the categorical definition, without reference to the many variations on each theme that we have sought to differentiate in this paper.

TABLE III

STATE-FUNDED, NON-CREDIT, POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS -- AN OVERVIEW --

States	Programs									
	GPE	ELS	UUS	CNX	CUR	DHP	UFL	PAR	EED	SPC
AL				x		x				
AK		x								
AR					x					
CA		x					x			
FL	x	x	x	x		x	x			x
GA		x	x	x						
HI			x				x		x	
IL	x				x					
IA	x	x	x	x	x					
KY					x					
ME						x				
MD	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	
MA					x	x		x		
MI	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
MO			x	x						
NJ		x	x							
NY							x		x	
NC	x	x	x	x	x		x			
OH			x	x						
OK		x	x	x		x	x			

- continued next page -

TABLE III -- AN OVERVIEW (Continued)

	GPE	ELS	UUS	CNX	CUR	DHP	UFL	PAR	EED	SPC
OR	x									
PA		x		x						
TX		x	x		x		x			
UT	x	x		x		x	x			
VT		x					x			
WA		x	x		x					
WV		x								
WI	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	
WY			x							
Totl Prog	9	17	15	13	10	10	11	2	4	2

Note: If a state has more than one program in a category, only one is counted in this table. The totals are to be read: "N states have programs in category Y."

CONCLUSION

Twenty-nine of the states, nearly 60%, fund some kind of non-credit, postsecondary education or training for adults. That conclusion is drawn from surveys returned from 47 states, augmented by state policy information in the Commission's files.

But when one analyses the nature of those programs, it is evident that most states do relatively little to serve the needs of adults in this arena, even

with the great variety of programs revealed. For certain kinds of postsecondary education and training, there is heavy reliance in the majority of states on federal funding and federal initiatives. Since our interest is in state initiatives and funding, our data exclude the federally funded JTPA programs and other federal initiatives, such as the Cooperative Extension Service, that reach a postsecondary clientele.

Only nine states fund non-credit, post-secondary education for the general adult public. Seventeen states or about one-third provide primarily state-funded courses and programs in general entry level occupational skills; eleven of these states also provide courses for updating and upgrading these skills. An additional four underwrite only programs for upgrading skills.

A battery of new programs, mostly within the current decade, addresses economic development and social welfare needs. Eighteen states report customized education and training programs to serve new and expanding industries, others who create new jobs, and existing business and industry. Sixteen states report adoption of programs for targetted populations such as displaced homemakers, the unemployed and those facing layoffs, those on public assistance, and the educationally and economically disadvantaged. Only ten of the 24 different states, however, appear to have mounted both economic development and social welfare efforts; the majority of the states that have attended to these problems have adopted one or the other approach, but not both.

There is great variety in the ways states define the objectives to be met, the clienteles to be served, the strategies to be used, and the authorized providers. In general, however, they prefer as providers the public

institutions of the state, in particular the community colleges and their counterparts offering vocational education.

In no state did we find a comprehensively designed program to serve the full range of social, economic, and educational problems that one or another state has addressed singly. In three states, however, there are accumulations of legislated programs that reach a broad segment of the adult learners with recognized needs. Michigan seems to have the widest range of state-funded education and training; Florida and North Carolina also have unusual breadth in programs, although North Carolina is light on programs for targetted populations except for the unemployed. Maryland and Wisconsin have responded by focussing efforts and utilizing resources within existing broad-based programs.

The rapid if not widespread expansion of programming in the past half decade suggests that many other states with aging workforces, shifting economic bases, and rising social welfare needs will soon be responding to the need for re-education and retraining with state programs, as federal funding diminishes. Such action should not be long deferred.

* * * * *

Note: The Commission would welcome updated information and corrections to the contents of this monograph. When writing, please provide the full name of the program, the year in which it was initiated, the definition of the clientele being served, the authorized providers of instruction, the authorized content of instruction, the state agency that administers the program and the sources of funding (please specify the percentages of each funding source). Please enclose copies of relevant statutes, regulations and guidelines. Send to the ACE Commission on Higher Education and the Adult Learner, 10840 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 203, Columbia, Maryland 21044.